

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated November 22, 2005, Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 14-22 stand allowed. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for a reconsideration of the rejections.

The Applicants would like to point out a supplemental response to the Office Action dated April 25, 2005 was previously submitted. The amendments above presume the amendments were made. However, it appears from the Examiner's rejections that the amendments were not considered in the rejection.

Claims 1, 5, 8, 9, 12, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamamoto* (5,774,819) in view of *Asanuma* (5,576,957). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As mentioned above, Applicants respectfully believe that the Examiner did not consider the supplemental amendment filed in August. That is, because the Examiner fails to allege two different transfer functions, Applicants respectfully believe that the Examiner has failed to consider the supplemental amendment submitted in August. Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the two references has a first transfer function block determining a desired lateral dynamic condition in response to the steering wheel angle and a second transfer function block that determines a modified steering wheel input as a function of the desired lateral dynamic condition in response to a base vehicle model. The present invention also includes a direction control block that determines a corrected steering wheel input as a function of the desired lateral dynamic condition and the actual lateral dynamic condition. A steering wheel input calculation block calculates a calculated steering wheel input in response to the corrected steering wheel input and the modified steering wheel input wherein the controller controls the steering actuator in response to the calculated steering wheel input.

Claim 8 has also been amended to recite a first transfer function and a second transfer function but is specific to the yaw rate rather than a general lateral dynamic condition. Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the references teaches the first transfer function and second transfer function in such a manner and therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejected claims.

Claims 6, 7 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yamamoto* and *Asanuma* in further view of *Serizawa* (5,097,917). As mentioned above, the *Yamamoto* and *Asanuma* references have several deficiencies described

above. The Serizawa reference also does not teach the deficiencies described above. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection as well.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all objections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 

Kevin G. Mierzwa, Reg. No. 38,049  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Date: 2-21-2006